

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in view of the above-referenced Office Action, and reconsideration is requested in view of the following remarks.

In response to the Office Action mailed on March 8, 2006, Applicant wishes to enter the following remarks for the Examiner's consideration. Claims 1-24 are pending in the application.

Elections/Restrictions

Applicant notes with appreciation that the traversal of the restriction filed on December 22, 2005 has been found persuasive and all claims are now examined on the merit.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112

Regarding the rejection of claims 8-17 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness, Applicant has amended claim 8 to overcome the rejection of these claims. Applicant respectfully requests that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Scherer et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection of claims 1-7.

There are at least several elements of the claims that are not taught, disclosed, suggested or otherwise anticipated by the Scherer et al. reference. While the examiner states that elements 1, 14 of Scherer et al. are a bracket having a bulkhead retaining portion, this is not borne out by a careful reading of the reference. Consider first element 1, which Scherer defines as an I/O plate or I/O board; reference column 3, line 8, for instance. Accordingly this I/O plate is illustrated as a flat baseplate. The commonly understood purpose and use of the I/O plate is not that of a bracket. Next, consider element 14, which is also not a bracket. The Scherer et al. reference defines 14 as a spring band (column 4, lines 8, 10, 18) having spring lamellae (column 4, lines 12 and 18), whose purpose is to maintain tension for mating connector 13. Moreover, Applicant submits that the combination

of elements 1 and 14 together do not anticipate “a bracket having a bulkhead retaining portion” as recited in claim 1.

Claim 1 as originally filed serves to further clarify this distinction of the bracket over the cited art, and recites that “the bracket further comprises a protective device mounting portion to which the protective device is coupled by the retaining portion.” To better clarify the term “bracket” Applicant has placed the recitations of claim 2 into independent claim 1. It is noted that the subject matter of originally filed claim 2 is patentably distinct over the Scherer reference. Moreover, with regard to the subject matter of claim 2, Scherer does not have a bracket or a protective device, and thus cannot anticipate the protective device mounting portion of the bracket. Furthermore, Scherer defines 11 as a bracket at column 4, lines 20-21. Scherer does not teach that a protective device is coupled to 11 but instead teaches that mating connector 13 is coupled to it at column 4, lines 20-21. Scherer never teaches that the mating connector is a protective device.

Additionally, the Scherer et al. reference fails to teach, suggest, disclose or otherwise anticipate “a protective device.” While the examiner states that element 13 of Scherer is a protective device, this is not in fact the case. The Scherer reference defines 13 as a mating connector, as is clear from column 4, lines 15, 20, etc. of the reference. Applicant can find absolutely no teaching of 13 being a protective device.

Since Scherer fails to teach a protective device, it cannot have a retaining element operable to couple the protective device to the bracket, as recited in the claim. There is no protective element, but instead a mating connector. There is no bracket, but instead an I/O plate. The only elements of Scherer that provide a retaining function simply serve to couple a mating connector to the I/O plate, and thus have no relation to the claimed invention.

With regard to claims 3 and 5-6, these claims depend from claim 2 and are further directed to the protective mounting portion or the protective device, which, as discussed above, are not taught, disclosed or otherwise anticipated by the Scherer reference. Furthermore with regard to claim 5, Applicant notes that 16 of Scherer is not a protective device mounting element as stated by the examiner. 16 is

described as “via screws 16 on mating connector 13” at column 4, lines 15-17 and 47. Furthermore with regard to claim 6, Scherer does not anticipate a protective device and thus cannot anticipate first and second protective devices.

With regard to claim 4, while the examiner states that 7 is a bulkhead mounting portion, the reference actually teaches that 7 are “threaded bolts.” There is no protective device mounting portion mentioned by Scherer. Again, the so-called protective device 13 is actually a mating connector, as will be discussed.

With regard to claim 7, Scherer does not teach, suggest, disclose or otherwise anticipate either a protective device or a plurality of protective devices. Moreover, Applicant notes that Scherer’s Figure 3 shows a flat plate with holes in it. There are no protective devices shown, much less a plurality of protective devices.

In light of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the Scherer reference does not teach, suggest, disclose or otherwise anticipate the recitations of claims 1-7. Applicant thus respectfully requests that this basis of rejection of the claims be withdrawn and that a Notice of Allowance for these claims be mailed at the Examiner’s earliest convenience.

Claims 8-21 are rejected under 35 USC 1-2(e) as being anticipated by Lo et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection of claims 8-21.

It is first noted that claims 8-21 relate to a power cabling assembly, having a bracket assembly as well as a power connector and bracket power connector fastening element, and methods thereof. These claims are therefore different in scope that the bracket assembly claims 1-7. Applicant has nonetheless amended claim 8, for example, to include the recitation that the bracket assembly further comprises a protective device mounting portion..., as recited in originally filed claim 13.

With regard to claim 8, Lo defines 10 as a power jack, not as a protective integral device as recited in the claim; please reference column 2, lines 46-47, 48, etc. Lo does not discuss any protective devices at all. Power jack 10 is a simple connector, and there no teaching, disclosure or suggestion to think otherwise.

151a and 151b are defined by Lo as bolts, see column 3, lines 36, for example. These bolts attach cover 15 to supporting portion 31 (column 3, lines 35-36). Cover 15 is not a bulkhead, but a simple cover for power lines. Supporting portion 31 is not a bulkhead, but is a bracket to install DC socket 10a into. It is then this whole assembly that is mounted to a bulkhead by connecting elements 310a and 310b. Bolts 151a, 151b do not connect anything to a bulkhead, as asserted by the examiner.

And, with regard to the subject matter of claim 13, inserted into independent claim 8, Lo does not teach, suggest, disclose or otherwise anticipate a protective device mounting portion, a protective device or a protective device retaining element. Again, Lo's 15 is a cover (see above).

With regard to claim 9, Lo's 321 is not a receiving portion of a bulkhead. Lo defines 321 as a "breach" in connecting portion 32, at column 3, lines 29-30. Connecting portion 32 is a mounting bracket for the power connector. This is clearly demonstrated in Lo's figure 2.

With regard to claims 10-11 and 18, Lo's electric wires 11 connected to power jack 10 and connector 12; please reference column 2, lines 48-50. There is no mention of protective devices, as asserted by the examiner.

With regard to claim 12, the rejection is not understood. The recitation of claim 12 do not match the basis of rejection used by the examiner in the first paragraph on page five of the office action.

With regard to claim 14, it is noted that Lo nowhere teaches, discloses, suggests or anticipates a protective device mounting portion and thus cannot anticipate the tab portion of the bracket assembly of the claim.

With regard to claims 15-17, similarly, Lo does not disclose a protective device mounting portion or protective devices at all. Again, Lo discloses only a power jack and a bracket to mount it.

With regard to claim 19-21, the arguments made above can be applied to the rejection of the method claims over the Lo reference.

In light of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the Lo reference does not teach, suggest, disclose or otherwise anticipate the recitations of claims 8-21. Applicant thus respectfully requests that this basis of rejection of the claims be withdrawn and that a Notice of Allowance for these claims be mailed at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

The Office Action does not have an examination of claims 20-24

Applicant cannot find a basis of rejection of claims 20-24, in which claims 10 and 22 are independent claims. It does not appear that these claims have been examined. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for these claims at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Although additional arguments could be made for the patentability of each of the claims, such arguments are believed unnecessary in view of the above discussion. The undersigned wishes to make it clear that not making such arguments at this time should not be construed as a concession or admission to any statement in the Office Action.

All claims are believed to be in allowable condition and such allowance is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience. The Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned if there are any questions about this application or response.

Respectfully submitted,



Renee' Michelle Leveque
Registration No. 36,193
Leveque IP Law, P.C.
221 East Church Street
Frederick, MD 21701
Phone (301) 668-3073
Fax (301) 668-3074

Dated: June 7, 2006